Thomas Merritt 5332 Thomas Avenu Oakland CA 94618

Aug 29th 2018

Via ECFS
Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: In the Matter of Petition of USTelecom for Forbearance Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 160(c); WC Docket No. 18-141; Category 1

Dear FCC,

I have internet service in two locations. One is served only by monopoly providers AT&T and Comcast. The prices are high and the service is nearly non-existent. The other location is serviced by competitive providers, and I currently receive service through Sonic.net. This is a night and day difference compared to AT&T. The service is excellent, the cost affordable, and the value is substantially better than any option I have with AT&T.

It is critical for the survival of competitive providers that incumbent providers not monopolize public infrastructure. Now is not the time to be raising the costs and reducing option to competitive providers because incumbent providers have bloated cost structures that prevent them from provide access to competitive providers at reasonable rates.

This is a clearly an attempt by inefficient incumbent providers to convert their competition into a profit center. The purpose of the regimen til now has been to provider equal access to public infrastructure at the incumbent carriers cost.. This should remain going forward.

As broadband access has become critical to modern society, the FCC should continue to encourage competition that has greatly expanded consumer broadband offerings. Changes that would limit competition or turn providing access to public infrastructure into a profit center for lethargic monopolistic providers should avoid so that the interests of consumers are fairly represented.

Thomas Merritt